

Bedford Sign Bylaw Committee
October 11, 2012, 7:30 p.m.
2nd Floor Conference Room Minutes

Attending: Jeff Cohen, Kevin Latady, Mark Siegenthaler, and Karen Kenney.

Absent: Lisa Mustapich, Ralph Zazula and Chris Laskey (Staff)

7:38 pm meeting called to order by Jeff Cohen.

Handouts: Draft Minutes of September 20 meeting; updated Table 40.1 Schedule of Signage Regulations; Up-to-Date Redline edited Sign Bylaws (through September 20 meeting); Jeff's email response to Jim O'Neil's most recent comments to the committee.

The committee reviewed the minutes from September 20 meeting. Motion to approve the minutes with minor changes by Kevin; Mark seconded the motion. Unanimous.

The members agreed to table the review of the latest iteration of Table 40.1 Schedule of Sign Regulations to the October 18 meeting.

The members discussed window signs and clarified that they believe the intent is that the 25% area requirement should apply to each window in which a sign is displayed, not 25% of the overall window area. If it were applied to the latter, one sign could take up an entire window if said window was one of four. Mark noted that the only mention to window signs in the Bylaw is as *temporary signs*. In such cases, no building permit is required; however, the members noted that once a window sign is installed, it effectively becomes a permanent sign.

The members discussed traffic control signs in Industrial Districts. These signs are not defined in the Bylaw and the members were not sure what types of signs fell under this definition (Stop, Yield, One-Way, etc.). Unless the signs were visible from the Public Way, the committee saw no reason to regulate them. A definition will need to be added to 40.2. The discussion was tabled to the October 18 meeting at which time Chris Laskey would be asked to provide clarification as to what these signs included.

Karen updated the committee on her discussions with the Council on Aging and BCAT regarding appearing before the CoA and on BCAT to inform the public of the SBRC's efforts. The CoA meets at 1 pm every Thursday. Jeff and Kevin said they could be available to meet with them. The committee needs only to inform them of when we'd like to appear and they'll put us on the agenda. Julie Turner (BCAT) said they tape at the end of the month for airing the following month (taping end of January or end of February). Appearing during the month of February seemed a logical timeframe. The committee needs to finalize which members will appear before the CoA and on the BCAT broadcast. The discussions were tabled to the October 18 meeting. Kevin also noted that there's an article about the SBRC in the Bedford Citizen.

The members discussed the committee's Status Report to the Selectmen. With minor edits/corrections, the members agreed that the report should be submitted to the Selectmen and that the committee should appear before the Selectmen prior to Special Town Meeting in November to discuss its recommendations. The report needs to identify why the committee is doing this and what Town Meeting should address. Jeff said he would amend the Draft and submit it to Rick Reed and request to be put on the Selectmen's meeting agenda.

Karen suggested that the town's website should provide a more obvious, direct link to the Sign Bylaw. It's currently not that easy to find and it would be helpful for those interested in learning about it to be able to find it quickly.

In Chris Laskey's absence, the Town Counsel update was tabled to the October 18 meeting.

The members agreed that the committee's report at Special Town Meeting in November did not need to include a PowerPoint presentation.

Discussions on strategies for bringing the committee's recommendations to Annual Town Meeting in 2013 were tabled to the October 18 meeting.

Jeff displayed a copy of the signage application by "Wicked Good Frozen Yogurt" that the Historic District Commission (HDC) approved for the Blake Block so the members could see the signage design strategy for the block.

The committee discussed Jim O'Neil's recommendation to prohibit LED lighting. The members reviewed the *Illuminated Sign* definition and all questioned why the type of illumination should be solely limited to the three types of luminaires listed. Everyone agreed that LED lights should not be used as the primary source of illumination, i.e., the sign should not display LED characters/symbols/words as the primary means of conveying the message; however, since LED lights provide an economical alternative for illumination, the members agreed that if LED lights were shielded or not directly visible from normal viewing angles, they could be acceptable.

The committee discussed edits to the Sign Bylaws, including the following:

- 40.2.A(5) – Edited paragraph as follows: "Illuminated Sign. Any sign which has characters, letters, figures, faces, backgrounds, designs or outlines illuminated by ~~incandescent, fluorescent, or high intensity discharge sources~~—sources not directly visible from normal viewing angles."
- 40.2.A(5) – Edited paragraph by adding , "or as an expression of free speech" to the end of the paragraph.
- 40.4, Section 3, Paragraph D, Window Signs – Edited paragraph by adding, "of the window in which the sign is displayed" to the end of the paragraph.
- 40.4, Section 5, Paragraph A – Insert, "than" between "less" and "three."

The next meeting is October 18th at 7:30 pm.

9:18 p.m. Kevin moved to adjourn; Mark 2nd. Unanimous

Respectfully submitted by Jeff Cohen